

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of the application are respectfully requested in view of the amendments and remarks herewith, which place the application into condition for allowance. The present amendment is being made to facilitate prosecution of the application.

I. STATUS OF THE CLAIMS AND FORMAL MATTERS

Claims 1-4 and 6-14 are pending in this application. Claims 1 and 9, which are independent, are hereby amended. Claim 5 has been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer of subject matter. It is submitted that these claims, as originally presented, were in full compliance with the requirements 35 U.S.C. §112. No new matter has been introduced by this amendment. Changes to claims are not made for the purpose of patentability within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. §101, §102, §103, or §112. Rather, these changes are made simply for clarification and to round out the scope of protection to which the Applicants are entitled.

II. SUPPORT FOR AMENDMENTS

Support for the recitations included in independent claims 1 and 9 is provided at least at page 4, lines 2-7, and page 10, lines 18-21 of the Specification as originally filed.

III. REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1-4 and 6-14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,945,987 to Dunn (hereinafter merely “Dunn”)in view of WO99/46922 to Ludtke, et al. (hereinafter merely “Ludtke”)and further in view of U.S. Publication No. 2001/0056478 to Wheeler, et al. (hereinafter merely “Wheeler”).

IV. RESPONSE TO REJECTIONS

Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*:

“...wherein said user server is configured to receive from the data server only program retrieval identification codes,
wherein the user server that receives the program retrieval codes previously received the broadcast program information, and
wherein each program identification code is included in an event information table appended to the broadcast program information, and
wherein only a select number of program retrieval identification codes are received, each of the program retrieval identification codes related to said at least one content keyword as a result of the searching by the data server...” (emphasis added)

Claim 1 relates to reducing network traffic when sending and receiving results from searching broadcast program information.

Applicants respectfully submit that Dunn, Ludtke, and Wheeler, taken alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest the above-identified features of claim 1. Specifically, Dunn, Ludtke, and Wheeler fail to teach that the user server is configured to receive from the data server only program retrieval identification codes, and that the user server that receives the

program retrieval codes previously received the broadcast program information, and wherein each program identification code is included in an event information table appended to the broadcast program information, and wherein only a select number of program retrieval identification codes are received, each of the program retrieval identification codes related to said at least one content keyword as a result of the searching by the data server, as recited in claim 1.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 is allowable. For the same, or similar reasons, independent claim 9 is also allowable.

V. DEPENDENT CLAIMS

The other claims are dependent from one of the independent claims discussed above, and are therefore believed patentable for at least the same reasons. Since each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual reconsideration of the patentability of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

Similarly, because Applicants maintain that all claims are allowable for at least the reasons presented hereinabove, in the interests of brevity, this response does not comment on each and every comment made by the Examiner in the Office Action. This should not be taken as acquiescence of the substance of those comments, and Applicants reserve the right to address such comments.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendment and remarks, it is believed that all of the claims in this application are patentable and Applicant respectfully requests early passage to issue of the present application.

In the event the Examiner disagrees with any of the statements appearing above with respect to the disclosures in the cited reference or references, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner specifically indicate those portion or portions of the reference or references, providing the basis for a contrary view.

Please charge any additional fees that may be needed, and credit any overpayment, to our Deposit Account No. 50-0320.

Respectfully submitted,

FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG LLP
Attorneys for Applicant

By 
Thomas F. Presson
Reg. No. 41,442
(212) 588-0800